

# United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/943,243	08/30/2001	Rolland F. Hebert		9377
29133 7 ROLLAND HE	7590 02/08/2007 RFRT		EXAM	INER
427 BELLEVUI	E AVE E. SUITE 301		LEWIS, PATRICK T  ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER  1623	
SEATTLE, WA	.98102			
	····			
SHORTENED STATUTORY	PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
2 MON	irue	02/08/2007	DADED	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/943,243	HEBERT, ROLLAND F.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	_
	Patrick T. Lewis	1623	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailinearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir  will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from  e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 F	s action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		is
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray  5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) Claim(s) 1-6 is/are rejected.  7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or are subject to restriction and/or are subject to by the Examine 10) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicant may not request that any objection to the	or election requirement. er. eepted or b)⊡ objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Sec	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).	40
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	= · ·		(a).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) [] Into-:: (	(PTO 412)	
Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D  5) Notice of Informal F  6) Other:	ate	,

### Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election without traverse of Group I (claims 1-7) during a telephone conversation on March 11, 2003, is acknowledged.

## Applicant's Response Dated June 24, 2003; September 2, 2003; February 19, 2004

- 2. Claims 1-6 are pending. An action on the merits of claims 1-6 is contained herein below.
- 3. The objections to the specification have been rendered moot in view of applicant's amendments filed on February 19, 2004.
- 4. The objections to claims 4 and 5 are maintained for the reasons of record as set forth in the Office Action mailed on March 19, 2003.
- 5. The objection to claim 6 has been rendered moot in view of applicant's amendment filed on February 19, 2004.
- 6. The rejection of claims 1-6 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is maintained for the reasons of record as set forth in the Office Action mailed on March 19, 2003.
- 7. The rejection of claims 1-5 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dunne et al. British journal of Pharmacology (1998), Vol. 125, pages 225-233 (Dunne) is maintained for the reasons of record as set forth in the Office Action mailed on March 19, 2003.

8. The rejection of claims 1 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunne in view of Matos et al. Bioorganic Chemistry (1987), Vol. 15, pages 71-80 (Matos) is maintained for the reasons of record as set forth in the Office Action mailed on March 19, 2003.

## Rejections of Record Set Forth in the Office Action Dated June 25, 2004

- 9. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
- 10. Claims 4-5 objected to because of the following informalities: claim 4 does not end in a period and claim 5 recites "chloride" twice. Appropriate correction is required.

No arguments have been set forth by applicants.

11. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

No arguments have been set forth by applicants.

12. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Dunne.

Applicant's arguments filed June 24, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that the instantly claimed composition has unique properties not recognized by the prior art. However, mere recitation of newly-discovered function or property, inherently possessed by things in prior art, does not cause claim drawn to those things to distinguish over prior art; Patent Office can require applicant to prove that subject matter shown to be in prior art does not possess

characteristic relied on where it has reason to believe that functional limitation asserted to be critical for establishing novelty in claimed subject matter may be inherent characteristic of prior art; this burden of proof is applicable to product and process claims reasonably considered as possessing allegedly inherent characteristics. Patent and Trademark Office does not have facilities for examining and comparing applicant's claimed composition with the prior art, and thus applicants have the burden of persuasion to make some comparison between materials in order to establish unexpected properties.

13. Claims 1 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dunne in view of Matos.

Applicant's arguments filed June 24, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Matos that deals with the effect of counter ions on the stability of SAM-e in solution and its relative stability in terms of rate of epimerization in solution as opposed to the powder form. Applicant's arguments have been carefully considered; however, the instantly claimed composition is not limited to a powder form.

#### Conclusion

- 14. Claims 1-6 are pending. Claims 1-6 are rejected. No claims are allowed.
- 15. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

#### Contacts

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrick T. Lewis whose telephone number is 571-272-0655. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday 10 am to 3 pm (Maxi Flex).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shaojia A. Jiang can be reached on 571-272-0627. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Patrick T∕Lewis, PhD Primary Examiner Art Unit 1623

ptl